



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,053	09/05/2003	Eduard F. Boeckmann	18195.43	1848
49358	7590	02/07/2006	EXAMINER	
CARLTON FIELDS, PA 1201 WEST PEACHTREE STREET 3000 ONE ATLANTIC CENTER ATLANTA, GA 30309			PARRIES, DRU M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/657,053

Applicant(s)

BOECKMANN, EDUARD F.

Examiner

Dru M. Parries

Art Unit

2836

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sashida et al. (5,257,180). Sashida teaches connecting a remote load (4) to a loop (11) to a power converter (100). He teaches devising an impedance (405a) for a feed back loop. He also teaches connecting the feed back loop to the power converter, wherein the feedback loop is closer to the converter than the load. (Fig. 1)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sashida et al. (5,257,180). Sashida teaches connecting a remote load (4) to a loop (11) to a power converter (100). He also teaches connecting a feed back loop to the power converter, where the feedback loop consists of two paths in parallel. The two paths being one with the voltage detector (300) and the other with the current detection circuit (406a) (Fig. 1). He also

Art Unit: 2836

teaches an error amplifier (403) connected to the feedback loop (Col. 14, lines 23-32). Sashida fails to teach a plurality of remote loads and the exact gain specified in claim 6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add more loads to the output of the circuit since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the gain to an ideal value since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

5. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sashida et al. (5,257,180) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Balakrishnan et al. (2005/0141246). Sashida teaches a power supply device as described above. Sashida fails to teach a feedback path including a low-pass filter or a capacitor-resistor network. Balakrishnan teaches a voltage feedback path including a low-pass filter comprising a capacitor-resistor network ([0029], lines 1-4; Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a low-pass filter into the voltage feedback path of Sashida's invention so that it could filter out the voltage spikes.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sashida et al. (5,257,180) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Komatsuzaki (JP 06-038537). Sashida teaches a power supply device as described above. Sashida fails to teach a feedback

Art Unit: 2836

path including a high-pass filter. Komatsuzaki teaches a voltage feedback path including a high-pass filter (Constitution). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a high-pass filter into the voltage feedback path of Sashida's invention so that it could filter out signals that are too low and could be misinterpreted.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sashida et al. (5,257,180) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of De Groot (6,465,992). Sashida teaches a power supply device as described above. Sashida fails to teach a feedback path including a band-pass filter. De Groot teaches a voltage feedback path including a band-pass filter (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a band-pass filter into the voltage feedback path of Sashida's invention so that it will reduce the ripple voltage around the passband.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x 36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2836

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

1-19-2006



BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800